

## REMARKS

**[0004]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-34, and 36-38 are currently pending
- Claims 3, 14, 25, and 35 are canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein
- Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are amended herein

**[0005]** Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 is found in the specification in at least paragraphs [0011] and [0121] – [0128]. No new matter has been added.

## Cited Documents

**[0006]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Lortz: Lortz, U.S. Patent No. 7,107,610
- Brezak: Brezak et al, EP Patent No. EP1619856 A1
- Krishnan: Krishnan et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,222,856

## Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35, and 38 Are Non-Obvious Over Lortz in view of Brezak

**[0007]** Claims 1-3, 5, 7-10, 12-14, 16, 18-20, 22-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lortz in view of

Brezak. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 in the manner set forth above. Moreover, Applicant respectfully notes that Claims 3, 14, 25, and 35 have been canceled, thus obviating the rejection with respect to the above claims.

#### Independent Claim 1

**[0008]** For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that Lortz neither teaches nor suggests at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

receiving a request for a client user to perform an operation on a resource of the resources, the request being received by an application hosted by the server and the operation being associated with modification of content or functionality of the resource;

...

building an output array and logging the output array to a log file when the request is authorized.

More particularly, it is respectfully submitted that Lortz does not teach or suggest "receiving a request for a client user to perform an operation on a resource of the resources, the request being received by an application hosted by the server and the operation being associated with modification of content or functionality of the resource," as presently recited in Claim 1 (emphasis added). However, the Action asserts that Lortz teaches the foregoing recitation at Column 1, lines 45-52 (Office Action, page 4; in connection with the rejection of dependent Claim 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

**[0009]** The aforementioned Examiner-cited portion of Lortz teaches that each client may be associated with “a resource operation representing an operation the client desires to perform using the resource” (Col. 1, lines 45-48). Further, Lortz teaches that “the client 12a is associated with resource operation 15 representing an operation to access a file residing on a system, communicate over a modem, print documents using the printer resources, or some other operation” (Col. 1, lines 48-52). However, Applicant has reviewed Lortz in its entirety and respectfully submits that Lortz fails to teach or suggest “the operation being associated with modification of content or functionality of the resource,” as presently recited.

**[0010]** For instance, Lortz merely teaches that the resource operation represents an operation to perform various actions, such as accessing a file residing on a system, communicating over a modem, or printing documents using printer resources (Col. 1, lines 45-52). Rather, Claim 1 recites that “the operation being associated with modification of content or functionality of the resource.” Further, because Lortz does not teach that the resource operation is not associated with modification of content or functionality of the resources, Applicant respectfully submits that Lortz does not teach or suggest the above recitation.

**[0011]** Additionally, Applicant has reviewed the Lortz reference and respectfully submits that Lortz is silent with respect to teaching or suggesting “building an output array and logging the output array to a log file when the request is authorized,” as presently recited in independent Claim 1. Yet, with respect to dependent Claim 8, the Action asserts that Lortz (at Col. 1, lines 45-52) “discloses...wherein the request further comprises an indication of whether the user desires to log a result of the operation

(Office Action, page 5). The Action further asserts that the above Examiner-cited portion of Lortz teaches “wherein a client is associated with a resource operation, which can include accessing a file” (Office Action, page 5). However, it is respectfully submitted that merely “accessing a file” is inherently distinct from “building an output array and logging the output array to a log file when the request is authorized,” as presently recited. Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Lortz.

**[0012]** Moreover, Brezak does not remedy the deficiencies in Lortz noted above with respect to independent Claim 1, nor does the rejection make any arguments to that effect. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Lortz and Brezak, both singularly and in combination with one another.

#### Dependent Claims 2 and 4-12

**[0013]** As stated above, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Lortz in view of Brezak. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2 and 4-12 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claim 1, as well as for the additional features that Claims 2 and 4-12 recite.

#### Independent Claims 13, 23, and 34

**[0014]** Independent Claims 13, 23, and 34 recite features similar to those discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 13, 23, and 34 are also patentable over Lortz and Brezak, both singularly and in combination with one another, for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent Claims 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38

**[0015]** As stated above, independent Claims 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over Lortz in view of Brezak. Accordingly, dependent Claims 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 13, 23, and 34, as well as for the additional features that Claims 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38 recite.

**[0016]** Further, without any teaching or suggestion as to how or even why the descriptions in Lortz may be modified, it is further submitted that one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify the implementations described by Lortz with Brezak, nor would it have been obvious to try. Further, as Lortz fails to teach or suggest several features recited in independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, and Brezak fails to remedy the deficiencies in Lortz set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have sought to modify Lortz using such a reference. Likewise, as the references noted above lack several features recited in independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, it would not have been obvious to try, at the time of the invention, to make the inventions as presently claimed.

**Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, and 36-37 Are Non-Obvious Over Lortz in view of Brezak in further view of Krishnan**

**[0017]** Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Lortz in view of Brezak, in further view of Krishnan. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**[0018]** As stated above, independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over Lortz in view of Brezak. Furthermore, Krishnan neither remedies the deficiencies in Lortz and Brezak noted above with respect to independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, nor does the rejection make any arguments to that effect. As a result, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are each patentable over Lortz, Brezak, and Krishnan, both singularly and in combination with one another. Accordingly, dependent Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites.

**[0019]** Further, without any teaching or suggestion as to how or even why the descriptions in Lortz may be modified, it is further submitted that one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to modify the implementations described by Lortz with Brezak or Krishnan, nor would it have been obvious to try. Further, as Lortz fails to teach or suggest several features recited in Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37, and both Brezak and Krishnan fail to remedy the deficiencies in Lortz set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have sought to modify Lortz using such references. Likewise, as the references noted above lack several features recited in Claims 4, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 26, 28, 32, 36, and 37, it would not have been obvious to try, at the time of the invention, to make the inventions as presently claimed.

**[0020]** Thus, Lortz, Brezak, and Krishnan, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or

suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34 are patentable over the proposed combination of references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2, 4-12, 15-22, 24, 26-33, and 36-38 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 13, 23, and 34, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

**[0021]** Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-34, and 36-38 are not obvious over the various combinations of Lortz, Brezak, and Krishnan, and therefore, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### Conclusion

**[0022]** For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-34, and 36-38 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

**[0023]** The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action, and could not have been presented previously because the Non-Final Office Action rejected claims based on new art not previously of record. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

  
Dated: 6/30/09  
Brett J. Schlameus (brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)  
Registration No. 60827

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826